



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/606,063	06/29/2000	Sunil Contractor	BS99-207	7446

28970 7590 08/25/2004

SHAW PITTMAN
IP GROUP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 1300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

ESCALANTE, OVIDIO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2645

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/606,063

Applicant(s)

CONTRACTOR, SUNIL

Examiner

Ovidio Escalante

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on June 4, 2004. **Claims 1-36** are now pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1,8 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Voit US Patent 6,163,597.

Regarding claim 1, Voit teaches a method for routing a call from a calling party to a called party (col. 5, line 62 - col. 6, line 29) comprising:

receiving the call at a service switching point (col. 7, lines 55-62);

querying a service control point (142) for instructions to route the call, (col. 7, line 61 - col. 8, line 3);

providing information related to the call to a geographic information system (GIS system), (e.g. as shown in fig. 1 the GIS system reads on at least Headqtrs Office 100 with associated customer database 150; col. 3, lines 43-59; col. 8, lines 7-15; the database system is consulted for information), wherein the GIS system is located at a location associated with the called party, (fig. 1; col. 7, lines 13-34);

obtaining a forwarding telephone number of the called party from the GIS system, wherein the forwarding telephone number is found by the GIS system, (col. 7, lines 35-5; col. 8, lines 14-19; in col. 3, lines 43-59 Voit teaches of querying/consulting databases for needed information, therefore since the SCP queries databases for information then the

Art Unit: 2645

database/processing means associated with the database finds the number and delivers the information to the SCP); and

routing the call to a location associated with the forwarding telephone number, (col. 8, lines 14-19).

Regarding claims 8 and 15, Voit teaches wherein the location is an optimal location based on criteria set by the called party, (col. 2, lines 56-67; col. 3, lines 8-26; col. 7, lines 13-34).

Regarding claim 11, Voit teaches wherein the GIS system is maintained by the called party, (col. 7, lines 13-34).

Regarding claim 12, Voit teaches wherein the GIS system is maintained by a telephone company, (col. 7, lines 13-34).

Regarding claim 13, Voit teaches a system for routing a call from a calling party to a called party (col. 5, line 62-col. 6, line 29) comprising:

a service switching point (120 or 135), (col. 7, lines 55-62);

a trigger provisioned at the service switching point for detecting the call, wherein the trigger causes the service switching point to generate a query, (col. 7, line 61- col. 8, line 3); and

a service control point for receiving the query and for obtaining a forwarding telephone number from a GIS system, (col. 3, lines 43-49; col. 8, lines 7-13), wherein the forwarding telephone number is found by the GIS system, (col. 7, lines 35-54; col. 8, lines 14-19), wherein the GIS system is located at a location associated with the called party, (col. 7, lines 13-34; fig. 1),

Art Unit: 2645

wherein the forwarding telephone number is associated with a location of the called party, (col. 7, lines 35-54), and

wherein the call is routed to the location of the called party, (col. 8, lines 14-19).

Regarding claim 14, Voit teaches wherein the trigger is a Public Office Dialing Plan (PODP) trigger, (fig. 1; col. 7, line 61-col. 8, line 19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit in view of Shaffer US Patent 6,091,810.

Regarding claims 2-7, while Voit teaches of providing a telephone number to a first database and of providing zip code information to a second database and wherein the zip code information is derived from street addresses and X-Y coordinates, Voit does not specifically teach of providing the address, telephone number of X-Y coordinates to the GIS system.

Shaffer teaches that it was well known in the art to use the telephone number of the calling party, (table 1; table 2; col. 19, lines 16-27; col. 20, lines 17-42), street address of the calling party, (col. 5, lines 47-54) and the X-Y coordinates (col. 10, lines 13-26) to obtain a forwarding number based on the provided information.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Voit by providing the additional information to the GIS system so that the GIS system can obtain the closest called party destination number to the

Art Unit: 2645

SCP based on the location of the calling party. Shaffer teaches that X-Y coordinates and street address provide a more accurate location information that merely using zip codes.

6. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit in view of Riskin US Patent 4,757,267.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, while Voit teaches of allowing the called party to modify the database so that the best destination telephone can be selected for the calling party based upon location information, Voit does not specifically teaches that the optimal location is a location that is physically closest to the calling party or has the least travel time.

However, the Examiner notes that it would have been obvious over Voit to include those steps since the area around the calling party can be customized and therefore one would have designated the closest destination since Voit teaches of defining areas based on streets and local address rather than e.g. the area code of the calling party

Nonetheless, Riskin teaches that it was well known to provide a system in which the a optimal location is a location that is physically closest to the calling party, (col. 18, lines 30-48) and wherein the optimal location is a location that has the least travel time from the calling party, (col. 3 lines 65-68; col. 19, lines 21-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Voit to provide a destination that is physically the closes or least travel time as suggested by Riskin so that the calling party can be routed to the closest destination number that services their needs.

7. Claims 16-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson US Patent 5,963,861 in view of Shaffer US Patent 6,091,810.

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claim 16, Hanson teaches a method for routing a call from a calling party to a called party (abstract; figs. 4 and 5) comprising:

receiving the call intended for the called party at a switch (MTSO), (col. 3, line 56- col. 4, line 19);

querying a control point (HLR) for instructions to route the call, (col. 4, lines 19-29);

presenting the calling party with a menu of choices prior to contacting a GIS system, wherein the GIS system is located at a location associated with the called party, (col. 4, lines 19-29; the database 44 services the called party therefore it is located at a location associated with the called party);

receiving from the calling party a selection based on the menu of choices, (col. 4, lines 28-32);

providing the selection to a GIS system, (col. 4, lines 32-56; the database 44 comprises geographic information such as addresses).

obtaining a forwarding telephone number of the called party from the GIS system, wherein the forwarding telephone number is found by the GIS system, (col. 4, lines 1-7; since the DB 44 is asked to provide information then the DB 44 inherently has the intelligence to find the required information); and

routing the call to a location associated with the forwarding telephone number, (col. 5, lines 1-7).

While Hanson teaches of a wireless network system and using network elements that are part of the Advanced Intelligent Network such as Intelligent Peripherals and using SS7 signaling, Hanson does not specifically teach of using a service switching point or service control point.

Art Unit: 2645

However, since Hanson provides for using elements associated with a landline network the Examiner believes that it would have been obvious to use SSPs or SCP if the system of Hanson was implemented in a landline system based on the suggest of using landline network peripherals as taught above.

Nonetheless, Shaffer teaches that it was well known in the art to use a GIS system in which the GIS system involves the use of SSPs and SCP and wherein the SSP queries for information for forwarding numbers, (col. 18, lines 15-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Hanson by incorporated the system into a IN/AIN network as taught by Shaffer so that calls to landline based number or calling parties can use location based service as suggest by Shaffer.

Regarding claims 17-22, while Hanson teaches of providing a selection to a GIS system, Hanson does not specifically teach of providing the address, telephone number of x-y coordinate to the GIS system.

Shaffer teaches that it was well known in the art to use the telephone number of the calling party, (table 1; table 2; col. 19, lines 16-27; col. 20, lines 17-42), street address of the calling party, (col. 5, lines 47-54) and the X-Y coordinates (col. 10, lines 13-26) to obtain a forwarding number based on the provided information.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Voit by providing the additional information to the GIS system so that the GIS system can obtain the closest called party destination number to the SCP.

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claim 23, Hanson teaches wherein the location is an optimal location based on criteria set by the called party, (col. 5, lines 8-42).

Regarding claim 24, Hanson teaches wherein the optimal location is a location that is physically closest to the calling party, (col. 2, lines 22-29).

Regarding claim 25, Hanson teaches wherein the optimal location is a location that has the least travel time from the calling party, (col. 2, lines 22-29).

Regarding claim 26, Hanson teaches wherein the location is an optimal location based on the selection received from the calling party, (col. 4, lines 23-49).

8. Claims 27-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit in view of Shaffer US Patent 2002/0136381.

Regarding claim 27, Voit teaches a method for routing a call from a calling party to a called party (col. 5, line 62 - col. 6, line 29) comprising:

receiving the call at a service switching point (col. 7, lines 55-62);

querying a service control point (142) for instructions to route the call, (col. 7, line 61 - col. 8, line 3);

providing information related to the call to a geographic information system (GIS) system, wherein the GIS system is located at a location associated with the called party, (e.g. as shown in fig. 1 the GIS system reads on Headqtrs Office 100 with associated customer database 150; col. 3, lines 43-59; col. 8, lines 7-15; also the database system is consulted for information),

obtaining a forwarding telephone number from the GIS system, wherein the forwarding telephone number is found by the GIS system (col. 7, lines 35-5; col. 8, lines 14-19; also in col. 3, lines 43-59 Voit teaches of querying/consulting databases for needed information, therefore

Art Unit: 2645

since the SCP queries databases for information then the database/processing means associated with the database performs the searching and delivers the information to the SCP);

Voit does not specifically teach soliciting the calling party to select one of the plurality of forwarding telephone numbers.

Shaffer teaches that it was well known in the art to solicit the calling party to select one of a plurality of forwarding telephone numbers, (paragraphs 131-133 of Shaffer). It would have been obvious that once the caller selects a number then the system may route the call to the one of the plurality of forwarding telephone numbers if the calling party responds within a predetermined duration, (paragraphs 131-133 of Shaffer); and route the call to a default location if the calling party fails to respond within the predetermined duration, (col. 4, lines 4-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Voit by solicit the calling party to select a number as taught by Shaffer so that the caller can decide which location is closes to them if the system returns more than one close location.

Regarding claims 28-33, while Voit teaches of providing a telephone number to a first database on of providing zip code information to a second database and wherein the zip code information is derived from street addresses and X-Y coordinates, Voit does not specifically teach of providing the address, telephone number of X-Y coordinate to the GIS system.

Shaffer teaches that it was well known in the art to use the telephone number of the calling party, (paragraphs 131-132), street address of the calling party, (paragraphs 131-132) and the X-Y coordinates (paragraphs 131-132) to obtain a forwarding number based on the provided information.

Art Unit: 2645

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Voit by providing the additional information to the GIS system so that the GIS system can obtain the closest called party destination number to the SCP.

Regarding claim 34, Voit in view of Shaffer teach wherein each of the plurality of forwarding telephone numbers is associated with a location of the called party, (paragraphs 131-133).

Regarding claims 35 and 36, while, Voit in view of Shaffer teach of forwarding the call to a default location, Voit in view of Shaffer does not specifically teach that the default location is the called party's corporate headquarters or customer service representative. However, the examiner believes that it would have been obvious to route the call to the called party's corporate headquarters or the customer service representative since the system of Voit in view of Shaffer routes the call to other numbers that is related to the dealer (paragraphs 131-133) and Voit teaches of using customer headquarters for information on where to route the caller, (fig. 1).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed June 4, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that there is no disclosure of a GIS system as recited in claims 1 and 13. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner believes that Voit has a GIS system since Voit uses geographic information (ZIP codes) in the system. Furthermore, since there is no specific limitation that

Art Unit: 2645

further define "GIS" in the claims, then given the broadest reasonable interpretation, any system that provides or associates with geographic information (e.g. zip codes) reads on a GIS system.

Applicant contends that Voit does not teach that a forwarding telephone number of a called party is obtained from the GIS system, as recited in claims 1 and 13. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As stated in the office action the GIS system is customer databases and Headquarters 102. In col. 3, lines 43-49 and col. 8, lines 7-15, Voit teaches that the second database (GIS System) is consulted so that a telephone number this is associated with the zip code can be sent from the database (GIS) to the requesting entity. Therefore, given the Examiner's interpretation of GIS, the Examiner believes that a number is forwarded from the GIS database 150 to the requesting entity.

Applicant contends that Voit does not teach that the GIS system is located at a location associated with the called party since Voit teaches that the contents of the proprietary database 146 is accessible only to the telephone operating company. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner did not read the proprietary database 146 as the GIS system but database 150 which is associated with the headquarters of the called party. Further, since each customer database 140-150 is "associated" with a specific Headquarter office and since each called party is "associated" with a specific Headquarter office, then the GIS system is located at a location that is "associated" with the called party.

Applicant contends that neither Hanson nor the Shaffer '810 Patent teaches the GIS system "is located at a location associated with the called party," as recited in amended claim 16. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Art Unit: 2645

The Examiner believes that Hanson teaches that database 44 is located at a location associate with the called party since Hanson states that the database 44 “services” the called party as stated above in the Office Action.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

Art Unit: 2645

(703) 872-9306, (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal
Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Ovidio Escalante whose telephone number is 703-308-6262. The
examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30AM - 5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Fan S Tsang can be reached on 703-305-4895. The fax phone number for the
organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ovidio Escalante
Examiner
Group 2645
August 20, 2004

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

